Lockheed Martin IS&GS – Civil
Energy & Environment
ESAT Region 3
US EPA Environmental Science Center
701 Mapes Road Ft. Meade, MD 20755-5350
Telephone 410-305-3037 Facsimile 410-305-3597

LOCKHEED MARTIN
We never forget who we're working for™

Date: February 22, 2012

Subject: Organic Data Validation (M3 Level)
Case: R33917
Project: 480-15814-1
Site: Dimock

From: Ex. 4 - CBI

To: Colleen Walling
ESAT Region 3 Project Officer

OVERVIEW

Third party Case R33917, Project 480-15814-1, consisted of twenty (20) aqueous samples including three (3) field blanks and one (1) rinsate blank analyzed for ethylene glycol, diethylene glycol, triethylene glycol, 2-methoxyethanol and 2-ethoxyethanol. Samples were analyzed by TestAmerica Buffalo (TAL BUF) according to Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste SW-846 Method 8015B.

SUMMARY

Data were validated according to Region 3 Modifications to the National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review, Level M3 and is assigned the Superfund Data Validation Label S4VM (Stage_4_Validation_Manual). Areas of concern with respect to data usability are listed below.

MAJOR PROBLEM

- Peaks were detected in the GC/FID Method 8015B glycols analysis within the retention time window of target compounds diethylene glycol and triethylene glycol. However, the positive identification of these target compounds was not confirmed via second GC column and/or GC/MS analysis. For this reason, the target compounds were qualified "R" on the Data Summary Forms (DSFs) as their absolute identity could not be proven.

DIM0182690

MINOR PROBLEM

- The laboratory employed a four (4) point calibration curve for the analysis of the compounds requested; however, Method 8015B specifies the use of a five (5) point curve. Positive results have already been qualified "R" as explained in "Major Problem."

NOTES

- Reported recoveries and Relative Percent Differences (RPDs) in Laboratory Control Sample (LCS) analyses and Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) analyses of samples HW02 and HW05 were within control limits.

- The calibration factors calculated by the reviewer were slightly different than those calculated by the laboratory. Results calculated using these calibration factors were within rounding errors from laboratory and data validation results.

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A – Glossary of Data Qualifier Codes
Appendix B – Data Summary Form(s)
Appendix C – Chain of Custody Records
Appendix D – Laboratory Case Narrative

DCN: R33917_480-15814-1